arXiv:0709.0738v1 [quant-ph] 5 Sep 2007

All languages in NP have very short quantum proofs

Hugue Blier

Alain Tapp

February 1, 2008

Abstract

In this note we show that all languages in **NP** have very short (logarithmic size) quantum proofs which can be verified provided that two unentangled copies are given. We thus introduce a new complexity class $\mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$ and show that $\mathbf{NP} \subseteq \mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$. This gives a new perspective when compared to the previously known result $\mathbf{QMA}_{\log} = \mathbf{BQP}$.

1 Introduction

In classical complexity, the concept of proof is extensively used to define very interesting complexity classes such as **NP**, **MA** and **IP**. When allowing the verifier (and the prover) to be quantum, we obtain complexity classes such as **QMA** and **QIP**. Quantum complexity classes can sometimes turn out to have surprising properties. For example, in contrast with the classical case, we know that quantum interactive proofs can be restricted to three messages without making them less powerful; that is, $\mathbf{QIP} = \mathbf{QIP(3)}$ [KW00].

Because of the probabilistic nature of quantum computation, the most natural quantum generalisation of **NP** is **QMA**. This is the class of languages having short quantum proofs. A quantum proof obviously requires a quantum verifier but behaves similarly to a classical proof with regards to completeness and soundness. Since group-non-membership is in **QMA**[Wat00], but is not known to be in **MA**, we have an example of a statement having short quantum proofs but no known short classical proof.

In this note we are interested in *very* short quantum proofs. By very short we mean of logarithmic size. Classically, when considering a polynomial-time verifier, the concept of logarithmic-size classical proofs is not interesting. Any language having very short classical proofs would also be in **P**, since one can go through *every* possible logarithmic length proof in polynomial time.

In the quantum case, very short quantum proofs could be interesting. Any reasonable classical description of a quantum proof requires a polynomial number of bits and thus one cannot try all quantum proofs using a classical simulator. That being said, if the verifier is simple enough, the optimisation problem of finding a proof that makes the verifier accept with high enough probability can be turned into a semi-definite programming[VB96, Ali95] problem of polynomial size. Thus, if the verifier is simple enough, then the language is in **P**. Also, if no restriction is put on the verifier, then it is still only in **BQP** [MW04].

Although we just argued that very short classical and quantum proofs seem uninteresting, by changing slightly the rules of the game we will get an interesting complexity class. We will show in this note that all languages in **NP** have very short *quantum* proofs that can be checked by a quantum verifier provided he is given two unentangled copies of it. We thus introduce a new complexity class $\mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$ and show that $\mathbf{NP} \subseteq \mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$.

2 Definition and statement of result

A formal definition of the class $\mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$ follows. Informally, it can be seen as the class of languages for which there exists a very short quantum proof. The peculiarity of the class is that two unentangled copies of the proof are required to convince the verifier. The verifier is polynomial-time and does not have to trust the prover that the two copies are identical, but he must assume that they are not entangled. One way to ensure that the two copies are not entangled could be to get them from two provers who have never interacted before. Another way would be in a context where there is a large number of such proofs and the verifier selects two of them at random. In that context, because of the quantum de Finetti theorem [KR05], we know that the two proofs would be almost unentangled. We leave the careful analysis of that case for future work.

Definition 2.1. *A language L is in $\mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$ if there exists a BQP algorithm V, a polynomial p and a constant c such that the following two statements hold:*
1) if $x \in L$, with $|x| = n$, there exists a state $|w\rangle = |w_1\rangle \otimes |w_2\rangle \in \left(\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes c\log(n)}\right)^{\otimes 2}$ such that $\Pr[V(|w\rangle) = \textit{accept}] = 1$.

2) if $x \notin L$, with $|x| = n$, then for all states $|w\rangle = |w_1\rangle \otimes |w_2\rangle \in \left(\mathcal{H}_2^{\otimes c\log(n)}\right)^{\otimes 2}$, $P[V(|w\rangle) = accept] < 1 - \frac{1}{p(n)}$.

The main result of this note is that $\mathbf{NP} \subseteq \mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$. This will be done by showing that the following well known **NP**-complete language is in $\mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$.

Definition 2.2. **3COL** *is the set of graphs $G = (V, E)$ (using any natural encoding into string) for which there exists a coloring $C : V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ such that for all (x, y) in E, $C(x) \neq C(y)$.*

Theorem 2.3. $\mathbf{NP} \subseteq \mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$

Proof. This will be proven in the next section by showing that **3COL** is in $\mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$. The verifier algorithm is described in the next section. Theorem 2.8 will provide completeness, and theorem 2.14 will provide soundness. ☐

2.1 Useful results

We will need the following notions of distance between pure quantum states and between classical probability distributions in our proof given in the next section.

Definition 2.4. $D(|\Psi\rangle, |\Phi\rangle) = \sqrt{1 - |\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle|^2}$

Definition 2.5. *Let $P = \{p_1, \cdots, p_k\}$ and $Q = \{q_1, \cdots, q_k\}$ be two probability distributions. Then, $D(P, Q) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{k} |p_i - q_i|$.*

We will make use of the following relationship between the quantum and classical notions of distance [NC00].

Theorem 2.6. *Let M be a von Neumann measurement. Let P and Q be the distribution of outcomes when performing M on $|\Psi\rangle$ and on $|\phi\rangle$ respectively. Then $D(|\Psi\rangle, |\Phi\rangle) \geq D(P, Q)$.*

In [BCWW01] a very useful and simple test, called the **swap-test**, was introduced. This test can be used to verify that two unentangled registers contain the same pure state. We will not repeat the description of the test here but we will state the following useful fact.

Theorem 2.7. *When the* **swap-test** *is applied to $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$, it has a failure probability of $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{|\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle|^2}{2}$.*

2.2 Protocol and completeness

In this section we describe the verifier for the language **3COL**. The protocol description might become more clear when reading the completeness proof that follows.

Verifier for $G, |\Psi\rangle, |\Phi\rangle$

The two copies of the proof $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$ are both regarded as vectors in $\mathcal{H}_n \otimes \mathcal{H}_3$, respectively the node and color part of the register. The verifier performs one of the following three tests with equal probability. If the test succeeds, he accepts, and otherwise he rejects.

- **Test 1:** (Equality of the two registers), Perform the swap test on $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$ and reject if the test fails.
- **Test 2:** (Consistency with the graph), $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$ are measured in the computational basis, yielding $(i, C(i)), (i', C'(i))$,
  a) if $i = i'$, verify that $C(i) = C'(i)$.
  b) otherwise if $(i, i') \in E$ verify that $C(i) \neq C'(i)$.
- **Test 3:** (All nodes are present) For both $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$, measure the index part of the register and the color part separately in the Fourier basis. If the outcome of the measurement of the color part is $F_3|0\rangle$ and the outcome for the index part is not $F_n|\overline{0}\rangle$, then reject.

The following theorem states that the protocol has completeness 1.

Theorem 2.8. *If $x \in$ **3COL** then there exists a proof that the verifier described earlier will accept with probability 1.*

Proof. Let the quantum proof be $|\Psi\rangle = |\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_i |i\rangle |C(i)\rangle$ where C is a valid coloring of the graph G. Since $|\Psi\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$, we have that test 1 will always succeed. Because C is a valid coloring of G, we have that test 2 succeeds with probability 1. To see that test 3 will also succeed with certainty, it is sufficient to see that:

$$(I \otimes F_3) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_j |j\rangle |c_j\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_j |j\rangle \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_k e^{2\pi i c_j k} |k\rangle$$

and therefore, if the color register is measured to be in state $|0\rangle$, the resulting state will be $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_i |i\rangle = F_n|0\rangle$. □

2.3 Soundness

Let's now consider the case where $G \notin \mathbf{3COL}$. Theorem 2.14 at the end of this section states that if G is not 3-colorable, then there is a non-negligible probability that one of the three tests will fail. To prove this, we will require the following five simple lemmas.

Because we know that the two registers given by the prover are not entangled, they can be written separately as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i \alpha_i |i\rangle \sum_j \beta_{i,j} |j\rangle \qquad |\Phi\rangle = \sum_i \alpha'_i |i\rangle \sum_j \beta'_{i,j} |j\rangle$$

where $\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = 1$ and $\forall i \ \sum_j |\beta_{i,j}|^2 = 1$ and likewise for $|\Phi\rangle$. It is not hard to see that the use of unentangled mixed states would not help the prover.

The following lemmas will give us some useful facts on the behavior of the state when measured in the computational basis. The next lemma says that if test 1 succeeds with high enough probability, then the distribution of outcomes will be similar for the two states.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$ be as defined earlier. If there exists a k and an l such that $|\ |\alpha_k \beta_{k,l}| - |\alpha'_k \beta'_{k,l}|\ | \geq 1/n^3$ then test 1 (the swap test) will fail with probability at least $\frac{1}{8n^6}$.*

Proof. Let $P_{i,j} = |\alpha_i \beta_{i,j}|^2$ and $Q_{i,j} = |\alpha'_i \beta'_{i,j}|^2$ be the probability distributions when $|\Phi\rangle$ and $|\Psi\rangle$ are measured in the computational basis. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{1 - |\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle|^2} &\overset{\text{def}}{=} D(|\Psi\rangle, |\Phi\rangle) \\
&\geq D(P, Q) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \left| |\alpha_i \beta_{i,j}|^2 - |\alpha'_i \beta'_{i,j}|^2 \right| \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \left| |\alpha_k \beta_{k,l}|^2 - |\alpha'_k \beta'_{k,l}|^2 \right| \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n^3}
\end{aligned}$$

This means that $|\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle|^2 \leq 1 - \frac{1}{4n^6}$ and that test 1 (the swap test) will fail with probability at least $\frac{1}{8n^6}$. □

The next lemma states that nodes with a high enough probability of being observed have a well-defined color.

Lemma 2.10. *Given that the quantum proof passes test 1 and part a) of test 2 with probability of failure no larger than* $\frac{1}{8n^6}$*, it must be that* $\forall i$ *such that* $|\alpha_i| \geq \frac{1}{n^2}$ $\exists! j$ *such that* $|\beta_{i,j}|^2 \geq \frac{99}{100}$.

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists an i such that $|\alpha_i|^2 \geq \frac{1}{n^2}$ for which two of the $\beta_{i,j}$ have a square norm larger than 1/200. Hence, w.l.o.g we can assume that $|\beta_{i,0}| > 1/200$ and $|\beta_{i,1}| > 1/200$. Because of lemma 2.9, we have that $|\alpha'_i|^2 \left|\beta'_{i,1}\right|^2 \geq |\alpha_i|^2 \left|\beta_{i,1}\right|^2 - \frac{1}{n^3} \geq \frac{1}{200n^2} - \frac{1}{n^3}$. Therefore, the probability of obtaining $(i, 0)$ when measuring $|\Psi\rangle$ and $(i, 1)$ when measuring $|\Phi\rangle$ is at least

$$\left(\frac{1}{200n^2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{200n^2} - \frac{1}{n^3}\right) \geq \frac{1}{8n^6}$$

when n is large enough. This is in contradiction with the hypothesis. Therefore, the probability for two of the three colors must be less than $\frac{1}{200}$, concluding the proof. ☐

The next three lemmas tell us what test 3 actually implies.

Lemma 2.11. *Given that the quantum proof passes test 1 and part a) of test 2 with probability of failure less than* $\frac{1}{8n^6}$*, then the probability of measuring* $|\overline{0}\rangle = F_3|0\rangle$ *in the Fourier basis on the color register is greater that* $1/5$ *when* n *is large enough.*

Proof. Assume that the node register is measured. If the outcome is i, then the probability of obtaining $|\overline{0}\rangle$ in the Fourier basis on the color register is given by

$$\frac{1}{3}|\beta_{i,0} + \beta_{i,1} + \beta_{i,2}|^2.$$

For all i with probability larger than $1/n^2$ lemma 2.10 applies, in which case we can assume w.l.o.g that $|\beta_{i,0}|^2 > 99/100$ and $|\beta_{i,1}|^2 + |\beta_{i,2}|^2 \leq 1/100$. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{3}|\beta_{i,0} + \beta_{i,1} + \beta_{i,2}|^2 &\geq \frac{1}{3}|\ |\beta_{i,0}| - |\beta_{i,1} + \beta_{i,2}|\ |^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{3}|\ |\beta_{i,0}| - \sqrt{2(|\beta_{i,1}|^2 + |\beta_{i,2}|^2)}\ |^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \end{aligned}$$

Now, note that only $n-1$ of the nodes can have a probability smaller than $1/n^2$, and therefore the probability of obtaining 0 on the color register is at least

$$(1-(n-1)\frac{1}{n^2})\frac{1}{4} \geq \frac{1}{5}$$

for large enough n. $\square$

Lemma 2.12. *Given a state* $|X\rangle = \sum_i \gamma_i |i\rangle$ *such that there exists an* l *with* $|\gamma_l|^2 < \frac{1}{2n}$, *then the probability of not getting* $|\overline{0}\rangle = F_n|0\rangle$ *when we measure* $|X\rangle$ *in the Fourier basis is at least* $\frac{1}{16n^2}$.

Proof. Let P and Q be the probability distribution when measuring $|X\rangle$ and $F_n|0\rangle$ respectively in the computational basis. Using theorem 2.6 we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{1-|\langle X|\overline{0}\rangle|^2} &= D(|X\rangle, |\overline{0}\rangle) \\
&\geq D(P,Q) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \left| |\gamma_i|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \right| \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\left| |\gamma_l|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \right| \\
&\geq \frac{1}{4n}
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that the probability of failing the test is greater than $\frac{1}{16n^2}$. $\square$

Lemma 2.13. *Assuming test 1, test 3 and part a) of test 2 succeed with probability larger than* $\frac{1}{8n^6}$, *then it must be that for all* i, $|\alpha_i|^2 \geq \frac{1}{10n}$.

Proof. Because of lemma 2.11, the probability of measuring 0 on the color register while performing test 3 is at least 1/5. Let $|X\rangle = \sum_i \gamma_i |i\rangle$ be the state after measuring 0 on the color register. Suppose that there is an i such that $|\alpha|^2 < 1/(10n)$. Again, because of lemma 2.11 it must be that $|\gamma_i|^2 < 1/(2n)$. Now, from that fact and lemma 2.12, we conclude that it would fail test 3 with too large a probability. Therefore, for all i, $|\alpha|^2 \geq 1/(10n)$. $\square$

Now, using lemmas 2.9,2.10, 2.11 and 2.13, it will be possible to prove the soundness of our verifier.

Theorem 2.14. *If $x \notin$ **3COL** then all quantum proofs will fail the test with probability at least $\frac{1}{24n^6}$*

Proof. Assume that the graph G is not 3 colorable and that it fails test 1, test 3 and part a) of test 2 with probability smaller than $\frac{1}{8n^6}$. Let $C(i) = \max_j |\beta_{ij}|$ be a coloring. Because of lemmas 2.9 and 2.10, this maximum is well defined. Since the graph is not 3-colorable, there exist two adjacent vertices v_1 and v_2 in G such that $C(v_1) = C(v_2)$. Because of lemma 2.13, when performing test 2 we have a probability of at least $1/(10n^2)$ of measuring $C(v_1)$ in the first register, and because of lemmas 2.9 and 2.13, we have a probability $1/(10n^2) - 1/n^3$ of measuring $C(v_2)$ in the second register. Putting this together, we have a probability larger than $\frac{1}{8n^6}$ of failing condition b of test 2. ☐

3 Conclusion

A very natural way to improve on our result would be (if it happens to be true) to prove that $\mathbf{NP} \subseteq \mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$ even when the gap between soundness and completeness is constant rather than only when it is non-negligible. Some progress has been made in that direction by Peter Shor, who was able to get a constant gap for proofs of size $\sqrt{n}\log(n)$. [Sho07]

Since one could guess a classical description of a very short quantum proof, one might believe that $\mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2}) \subseteq \mathbf{NP}$ and thus that $\mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2}) = \mathbf{NP}$. Unfortunately, in order to get that result one must weaken our definitions of $\mathbf{QMA}_{\log}(\mathbf{2})$ so that the verifier can be simulated efficiently classically.

4 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Frédéric Dupuis for his help with the language of Shakespeare and the QuantumWorks project for funding this research.

References

[Ali95] F. Alizadeh. Interior point methods in semidefinite programming with applications to combinatorial optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 5:13–51, 1995.

[BCWW01] Harry Buhrman, Richard Cleve, John Watrous, and Ronald de Wolf. Quantum fingerprinting. In *Physical Review Letters*, 2001.

[KR05] R. König and R. Renner. A de Finetti representation for finite symmetric quantum states. In *Journal of Mathematical physics*, volume 46, 2005.

[KW00] A. Kitaev and J. Watrous. Parallelization, amplification, and exponential time simulation of quantum interactive proof systems. In *ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2000.

[MW04] C. Marriott and J. Watrous. Quantum arthur-merlin games. In *IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, volume 14, pages 122–152, 2004.

[NC00] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information.* Cambridge, 2000.

[Sho07] Peter Shor. *Private communication*, 2007.

[VB96] L. Vandenberghe and S. Boyd. Semidefinite programming. *SIAM Review*, 38(1):49–95, 1996.

[Wat00] J. Watrous. Succinct quantum proofs for properties of finite groups. In *Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, page 537–546, 2000.